

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:**

Entry of the above amendments, and reconsideration of the claim rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested. Please cancel claims 2-5, 9-11, and 15-18 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 19, and 20 remain in the application. In this Response, claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 19, and 20 have been amended.

The amendments submitted above to certain paragraphs in the specification have been done so to correct informalities, such as to correct grammar.

Specifically, the amendment made to the paragraph on page 11 was done to correct grammar (two instances of the word “operation” should be “operations”).

The amendment made to the paragraph on page 14 was done to correct grammar (“This call or may” should be “This call may”).

No new matter has been added through any of these amendments.

The amendments submitted above to certain claims have been done so either in response to the Examiner’s rejections or objections or to correct claim dependency, to correct antecedent basis, to correct inconsistent claim element names, to put the claim in conventional form, and the like. No new matter has been introduced through any of these claim amendments.

**A.     Objections to the Specification**  
**For Informalities**

**Item 1 In The Office Action**

The Examiner objected to the abstract because of the following informalities (Note: the Item numbering utilized above and following matches that used by the Examiner in the office action):

“edit the object based the properties . . .” should read “edit the object based on the properties . . .”.

This correction has been made by Applicant and in response, withdrawal of the objection is requested.

**B. Rejection of Claims  
Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Items 2 and 3 In The Office Action

The Examiner has rejected claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 15-18 rendering the rejection moot as to these claims. Applicant has also amended independent claim 14 and dependent claims 19 and 20 to more distinctly distinguish Applicant's invention through the further limitations of: (explain limitations added).

(Claim 14)

“A tangible machine-readable storage medium”

Support for these amendments may be found in the specification on page 3, line 24 through page 4, line 1, and page 7, lines 19-25 in reference to FIG. 2.

Applicant believes that claims 14-20, as amended, are statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to tangible embodiments of a process and, accordingly, Applicant requests retraction of the Examiner's rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §101.

**C. Rejection of Claims  
Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Items 4 and 5 In The Office Action

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kruempelmann et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,191,410.

In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 14 to more distinctly distinguish Applicant's invention through the further limitations of:

(Claim 1)

“detecting by an application running in the computer system an edit operation request for an object displayed on the video display by the computer system associated with said application; and

sending, by said application, one or more parameters associated with said an-edit operation request to an abstraction layer via an interface provided by the said abstraction layer to initiate editing of the said object by the said abstraction layer;

receiving by said abstraction layer said one or more parameters associated with said edit operation request;

determining by said abstraction layer a container type for a container in which said object is displayed;

reading by said abstraction layer a set of properties related to said object to be edited;

reading by said abstraction layer a set of properties related to said container in which said object is displayed; and

editing said object based on said container type and said one or more parameters associated with said edit operation request.”

(Claim 8)

“a memory coupled with and readable by the processor and containing instructions associated with an application that, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to detect an edit operation request for an object displayed on the video display by the computer system associated with said application, send one or more parameters associated with said an-edit operation request to an abstraction layer via an interface provided by the said abstraction layer to initiate editing of the said object by the said abstraction layer causing the said abstraction layer to receive said one or more parameters associated with said the-edit operation request, determine a container type for a container in which the said object is displayed, read a set of properties related to the said object to be edited, read a set of properties related to the said container in which the said object is displayed to determine a type for the container, and edit the said object based on

~~the said~~ container type and ~~the said~~ one or more parameters associated with said received-edit operation request.”

(Claim 14)

“detecting by an application running in the computer system an edit operation request for an object displayed on the video display by the computer system associated with said application; and

sending, by said application, one or more parameters associated with said an edit operation request to an abstraction layer via an interface provided by the said abstraction layer to initiate editing of the said object by the said abstraction layer;

receiving by said abstraction layer said one or more parameters associated with said edit operation request;

determining by said abstraction layer a container type for a container in which said object is displayed;

reading by said abstraction layer a set of properties related to said object to be edited;

reading by said abstraction layer a set of properties related to said container in which said object is displayed; and

editing said object based on said container type and said one or more parameters associated with said edit operation request.”

Support for these amendments may be found in the specification on page 8, line 25 through page 11, line 25 in reference to FIG. 3, and on page 13, line 24 through page 15, line 24 in reference to FIGS. 7 and 8. Applicant submits that Kruempelmann et al. does not teach nor suggest the additional limitations.

Kruempelmann et al. is directed to managing the information display of various resources (See col. 1, lines 22-24). Messages are received indicating that information of a resource is to be displayed, and a user interface is formed for displaying the resource information by defining a pane in which to display the information and selecting a render operable to render the information in the pane (See col. 1, lines 24-30). Kruempelmann et al. teaches an abstraction layer, but the abstraction layer is quite different from that claimed by applicant. The abstraction layer 144 of Kruempelmann et al. “is operable to extract, correlate, and /or understand the

2947675-1

information and logic in enterprise infrastructure 150. In accomplishing this, abstraction layer 144 may aggregate and classify the information. For example, abstraction layer 144 may use metadata to categorize documents into multiple taxonomies, for browsing and/or retrieval. In particular embodiments, [abstraction] layer 144 stores pointers to documents in a folder hierarchy, which ensures nonredundant storage and allows access control to be tied to the roles of users.” (See col. 1, lines 58-66). The abstraction layer claimed by Applicant in independent claims 1, 8, and 14, however, **knows nothing about the applications, or the resources, those applications represent.** The abstraction layer claimed by applicant **only receives from the application parameters associated with an editing request** detected by the application. Based upon those parameters, and the abstraction layer’s ability to read properties associated with a container, and properties of objects contained within the container that is currently displayed, the abstraction layer is able to **edit the object based upon the passed in parameters** and the abstraction layers **knowledge of the container and objects within the container.**

Since the Kruempelmann et al. reference does not disclose expressly or inherently all of the elements and limitations of Applicant’s amended independent claims 1, 8, and 14, Applicant believes that these claims are not anticipated by Kruempelmann et al. and requests withdrawal of the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claims 6, 7, 12, 13, 19, and 20 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 8, and 14, and include all the elements and limitations thereof. As a result, and in light of the foregoing remarks concerning independent claims 1, 8, and 14, Applicant likewise believes that dependent claims 6, 7, 12, 13, 19, and 20 also overcome the Examiner’s rejection based on Kruempelmann et al. under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and withdrawal of that rejection in respect to these claims is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION:**

This Amendment fully responds to the Office Action mailed on November 19, 2007. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicant believes the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Thus, a bona-fide attempt has been made to ensure that the application meets all statutory requirements and is in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early indication to that effect is, therefore, courteously solicited. If a telephone conference would expedite allowance or resolve any additional questions, such a call is invited at the Examiner's convenience.

Please charge any additional required fees not paid, or fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17, if any are due with this response, or credit any overpayment to, deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(303) 357-1632

By: 

Stanley J. Gradisar, Esq., Reg. No. 42,598  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: April 18, 2008

